

SASKATCHEWAN NDP CAUCUS OFFICE'S
GUIDE TO SASKATCHEWAN PARTY ETHICS

A documented list of ethical violations by the Sask Party caucus in the first 100 days of the code

Spring Session 2006



Ethics

Introduction

The First 100 Days

On February 12, 2006 the Saskatchewan Party Members adopted a code of ethics that was supposed to govern the conduct for their party. To quote from the code: "Ethics are an ever-present, ongoing, fundamental aspect of the daily work of their party."¹

So they appear to be taking ethics seriously, but are they?

Keep in mind that Article V clause 1 of the Sask Party code of ethics states:

*"The Ethics Panel may initiate an investigation where it has reasonable cause to believe that there has been a breach of this code"*²

So therefore, it would seem reasonable that if a breach of this code was pointed out that the Sask Party would either launch an investigation, or at least explain why they wouldn't.

There is a long-standing tradition in politics that a government can be judged by its first 100 days in office. It seems only fair to apply that same standard to the Saskatchewan Party. What is their "scorecard" on the ethics front in the first 100 Days their code of ethics was in effect?

THE SASK PARTY SCORECARD

of Times there has been a possible breach: 10-16

**# of MLA's involved in these possible breaches: 15
(over ½ their caucus)**

#of calls for Investigations or Apologies: 5

of Actual Investigations: 0

of Reasons given for not calling an Investigation: 1

of times the Speaker has removed them from the House: 1

of Apologies: 1

How to define a “Breach”

The two sections of the Sask Party Code of Ethics that are most often breached are the clauses prohibiting “knowingly spreading false information” and “acting with conduct that is unbecoming of a member”

Keep in mind that the standard for “knowingly” spreading false information means that it has to be shown that the member *knew* it was a false statement when he made it, and the standard for “integrity in conduct” refers to when a number of <embers jointly knowingly make the same false statement (thus a conspiracy), or one Member acts in a way that a normal professional code of conduct would censer.

Even with these high standards for conduct, the Sask Party MLA's still fall short, as this document indicates

In other words, it is not good enough to claim they are breaching their code of ethics if they simply make a statement that we can prove to be false. We also have to prove that the person making the statement KNEW that it was a false statement when they made it.

This is a fairly high standard to set, and thus, all of the breaches of the ethics packages that are documented here are worthy of scrutiny, and worthy of at least a response from the Brad Wall.

If these cases are not breaches of the code of ethics, then what is?

Case 1: Treatment Centers

Who:

Sask Party MLA Ted Merriman

When: March 30 2006

(46 days after code of ethics passed)

What: Ted Merriman told reporters that a young man HAD to be sent to Alberta for addictions treatment, then later in the interview admitted that it was the parent's choice, and that there may have been beds in Saskatoon. He also forgot to mention that the facility was a joint Saskatchewan/Alberta treatment facility.

Mr. Merriman gave a press interview where he said, "I just had [a case] on the weekend where I worked with the family all last week. [There was a] 15 year old and we *had* to send him to Slimthorpe [treatment facility] in Alberta."³

Upon further questioning Mr. Merriman admitted that, quote, "Uh this was the parent's choice" and upon further questioning about whether there were treatment beds available in Saskatoon he said, "To be honest, I don't know the answer to that question"⁴

So Mr. Merriman claimed that the parents were forced to send their son to Alberta because there were no treatment beds available in Saskatchewan and then, moments later, admitted that that statement was false for at least two reasons. (For the record, Slimthorpe is a cost-shared facility between Alberta and Saskatchewan so he was actually wrong on three counts, but that could have been an honest mistake due to the fact the critic doesn't know that much about his portfolio)

Code of Ethics Violation: Article 4, Clause 6: the dissemination of false information ⁵

Call for Investigation: The Deputy Premier said in the house, "Mr. Speaker, I've asked the Leader of the Opposition to honour his own code of ethics that he has for all his members of the Legislative Assembly, Mr. Speaker, because in his code of ethics he says, when there in fact has been information that has been falsely disseminated, and knowingly so, there should be an action."⁶

Brad Wall's Response: All Mr. Merriman is guilty of is a "confusing scrum" *no investigation launched*⁷

Case 2: The Legal Aid Commission

Who: Sask Party MLA Don Morgan

When: April 9, 2006
(57 days after code of ethics passed)

What: Mr. Morgan made an accusation in the house that the Hilson Legal Aid matter was driven by a political vendetta. This accusation was unsubstantiated and thus Mr. Morgan claimed to the media he would withdraw that remark. He still has not done so 2 months later.

Jack Hillson was defeated as an MLA in the 2003 election and was not given back his job with the Legal Aid Commission. subsequently he filed a lawsuit against the Commission. This saga actually started on November 29, 2004 when Mr. Morgan stood in the house and said "His [The Minister of Justice] department turned that down. They deliberately interfered with that process [referring to the Hillson Matter]"⁸

It turns out that the chair of the Legal Aid Commission (Robert Gibbings) disagrees with Mr. Morgan's assessment of the matter. In a letter to the editor on December 3, 2005 the SLAC Chair Robert Gibbings stated that, "The SLAC's board made its decision not only without political influence or consideration, but totally unknown to any politician, governing or otherwise, until well after the fact."⁹

Never one to let facts get in the way of an argument, Mr. Morgan then claimed, in April 2006 in the House, that the minister was involved in a "political vendetta"¹⁰ against a former member of the house. It was pointed out by the Minister of Justice that this could not be true, "he [Morgan] said this government was punishing Jack Hillson, that the decision was political, that the commission had taken political direction. He should withdraw those remarks. We have Mr. Gibbings's statement on that. He should withdraw those remarks, and he should apologize to the commission."¹¹

When this happened the Minister of Justice reminded Mr. Morgan of the Sask Party Code of Ethics, "And I again remind the member from Saskatoon Southeast that he is an officer of the court. He is governed by something more than the Sask Party's code of ethics which is not worth more than the paper it's written on."¹²

Mr. Morgan was interviewed about this matter and had the following to say:

Question: "What makes you think there is government interference in this Hillson case?"

Mr. Morgan: "I don't know whether there is government interference"¹³

Later in the interview Mr. Morgan claimed that “I don’t want to accuse anyone of anything...”¹⁴ Which is a bit odd, since the entire interview is about his accusation that he had already made in the house, but again, the benefit of the doubt can be extended, perhaps he was just confused. However, later in that interview Mr. Morgan does make the following comments

Question: How can you make such scurrilous allegations?

Mr. Morgan: “If I am wrong, I will withdraw the statement”

Question: “If you are wrong that it was a political vendetta?

Mr. Morgan: “If I made that type of statement, *I will withdraw the statement*”

Question: “You don’t recall saying the words ‘political vendetta?’”

Mr. Morgan: “I don’t remember the words that I used”

Question: “It was half an hour ago”¹⁵

Again, the benefit of the doubt can be extended to Mr. Morgan and he will be taken at his word that he could not remember his accusation made minutes earlier. (Note that this is more generous than the Leader Post columnist who says, “to tell reporters that he suddenly can’t remember exactly what he said moments earlier is somewhat less than forthright”¹⁶, but again, the benefit of the doubt can be extended.) However, he does clearly agree to withdraw his remarks if he used the phrase “political vendetta”.

So Mr. Morgan checks the record and finds out that he did use that phrase and stands in the House to withdraw his remarks....no wait, he does the exact opposite and repeats the same phrase to the media the next day.

Question: So going back to the remarks you made in the house yesterday, you feel that they were all appropriate?

Mr. Morgan: What I’m willing to say today and, and, what my position is—that the conduct of the Minister gives the appearance of a political vendetta...

Question: You said it was a political vendetta yesterday...

Mr. Morgan: If I said that yesterday, I misspoke.¹⁷

So he now admits that if he said it was a political vendetta in the house then he misspoke, and the day before he said that if he made that type of statement that he would withdraw. So therefore, shouldn’t he withdraw the remark?

Not according to Mr. Morgan who responded to this issue in the House by saying, "Mr. Speaker, there will be no apologies for accusations against a government that insists on breaking the law and condones illegal activity."¹⁸

Mr. Morgan may not have told any outright lies in this whole affair (although even that is disputable) but even if you grant him every benefit of the doubt, that he misspoke (both days) that he actually forgot what he said moments earlier, and that he was only guilty of rhetorical excess when he made his accusation, he himself said that he misspoke and that he should withdraw his remarks.

Yet he has not done so. This shows a shocking lack of integrity in conduct and should have been, at the very least, investigated by the Saskatchewan Party's ethics board.

Code of Ethics Violation: Article 4, Clause 1: Integrity in conduct ¹⁹
--

Call for Investigation: On April 13, 2006 the Minister of Justice rose in the house to say, "Now the member from Saskatoon Southeast made an accusation that there was a political vendetta against another individual in this province. Then an hour later he couldn't remember making the accusation. Then he said he misspoke himself, Mr. Speaker, a word popularized by Richard Nixon, but which suits the member very well. Now where is the member's apology, Mr. Speaker?"²⁰

Then, on April 21, (over one week later) again, the Minister of Justice called on Mr. Morgan to apologize, saying "Now on top of, on top of accusing the Legal Aid Commission of being party to a political vendetta, of deliberately breaking the law, the member from Saskatoon Southeast [Mr. Morgan] wants to add that they're incompetent as well, Mr. Speaker. When is his apology going to be forthcoming, Mr. Speaker?"²¹

Mr. Morgan's Response: No apology or withdrawal. Even after he said he would and even after it was pointed out in the house that this contravened the Saskatchewan Party Code of Ethics, and after having three separate calls for an apology

Brad Wall's Response: No response to date - *no investigation launched*

Case 3: The “Buck Up” Comment

Who: Sask. Party MLA's
Bob Bjornerud and Ted Merriman

When: April 10, 2006
(58 days after code of ethics passed)

What: Mr. Bjornerud called Minister Wartman a liar for making up a quote from the Federal Agricultural Minister Chuck Strahl telling farmers to “buck up”. The only problem is that the Federal Minister did in fact make that statement – and Mr. Bjornerud *knew* that he made that statement. Mr. Bjornerud either mislead the house or mislead reporters when he contradicted himself multiple times in the pursuit of besmirching the credibility of Minister Wartman.

Mr. Bjornerud was questioning the Minister of Agriculture in the House on March 28th 2006. The Provincial Minister of Agriculture made reference to the Federal Minister of Agriculture's comments at a meeting on March 23 in Yorkton. The Provincial Minister of Agriculture said, “What did Chuck Strahl, what did Chuck Strahl, Minister of Agriculture for the federal government, say to the farmers when they were telling them how bad it was? What did he say? He said buck up, buck up farmers; forget it.”²²

Mr. Bjornerud replied, “*Well, Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear Chuck Strahl make that comment*”²³ Later that day, outside the house, when Mr. Wall was answering questions about a different code-of-ethics violation by Mr. Merriman he said that the government should be providing information that is “accurate and correct” and that this was not the case because the government was “*attributing comments to the federal agricultural minister that nobody knows, that nobody can see he made*”²⁴

Putting aside the fact that reporters remembered the Federal Minister's comment to “Buck Up” well enough that it was a headline in a number of newspapers.²⁵ It would be possible that Mr. Bjornerud and Mr. Wall were telling the truth and they did not hear the comment. It is true that Mr. Wall was not telling the truth when he said that “nobody” had heard the comment and the newspapers bear that out, but that may have been an honest mistake.

And yet, 2 weeks later Mr. Bjornerud had a completely different tale. In a media interview on April 10, 2006, he has this to say, “But there are a number of issues on which we differ. One is with the comments about Mr. Strahl's comments in Yorkton that day. *I mean I was there, I believe they were taken out of context.* The way I understood it was Strahl was saying we are stuck with CAIS for one more year”²⁶ and then later on in that same interview Mr. Bjornerud has this to say:

Question: What if Mr. Wartman had said buck up and stick with CAIS for another year? Would you be giving him the benefit of the doubt on that front?

Mr. Bjornerud: If I'd have heard it exactly *like I heard it from Mr. Strahl*.²⁷

Question: Please, Please, you are telling me that you would say that Mr. Wartman deserved the benefit of the doubt if he told farmers to buck-up? Under any circumstance?

Mr. Bjornerud: "If I knew exactly what he meant by it and I felt I did with Mr. Strahl...*Mr. Strahl did not say this in a rant. He said it in a calm voice* and every farmer that I talked to felt they understood what he said"²⁸

In other words on March 31st Mr. Bjornerud claimed in the House that he never heard the comment and, the same day, the Leader of the Opposition defended his members about making false statements and violating their own code of ethics by pointing out that the government made up this comment by Chuck Strahl. Then, two weeks later, Mr. Bjornerud suddenly remembers this comment? In fact he suddenly remembers it so well he can dispute the interpretation of the context? He remembers it so well that he can talk about the tone of voice that it was made in? He can remember discussing this comment with farmers afterwards? Mr. Bjornerud was obviously not telling the truth on one of those occasions. He was either lying in the house to attack the government or he was lying outside the house to reporters to attack the government. This was a deliberate attempt by at least Mr. Bjornerud, if not Mr. Wall as well, to use calculated falsehoods to attack the government.

And just to make matters even worse, on April 12, Mr. Merriman was giving his budget speech and in reference to this matter claimed that *Minister Wartman* was telling farmers to "buck-up" when clearly all that Minister Wartman was doing was quoting Chuck Strahl. Mr. Merriman said, "Mr. Speaker, that's why this budget will not work. You can't tell someone to buck up and then expect them to trust you on matters as important as the economy."²⁹

So much for Mr. Bjornerud's claim that the Sask Party would give Minister Wartman the benefit of the doubt and not take his words out-of-context. It only took them two days after saying they wouldn't take those words out of context to do exactly that. So not only did Mr. Merriman disseminate false information in the house, he created a situation where Mr. Bjornerud was then also guilty of disseminating false information to the media. The Sask Party false-information-dissemination machine was at peak workload that day.

But the hypocrisy doesn't stop there. In between forgetting he heard the comment and remembering that he heard the comment, Mr. Bjornerud continued his campaign to call Minister Wartman a liar. On April 6th (14 days after the comment was allegedly made and 4 days before he remembered hearing it) Mr. Bjornerud said, "Mr. Speaker, this looks like yesterday was about the fourth day in a row the NDP government has been caught not being completely accurate...I have a quote from our Minister of Agriculture: 'We did talk about me referencing Mr. Strahl's buck up comments when I spoke to him last week,' ...Mr. Speaker, now we have the Ag minister having to live up to his less-than-accurate quotes. Mr. Speaker, we've seen so many falsities this session from the NDP government, it's starting to become commonplace. They hoot and holler about credibility, but when it comes down to it, they're the ones whose credibility is routinely questioned. Mr. Speaker, they are the ones being caught explaining their misleading statements."³⁰

In other words, Mr. Bjornerud accused the *government* of having questionable credibility on this issue. He accused the government of being caught “not being completely accurate.” He accused the *government* of having “less-than-accurate quotes” and he accused the NDP of telling “falsities.” Mr. Bjornerud actually had the sheer nerve to stand in the house and tell Minister Wartman that *he* was making “misleading statements”! This goes beyond the pot calling the kettle black. This is a black hole calling the kettle, the stove, and a couple of other black holes black. This is both unbelievably hypocritical and extremely unethical.

And no apology has been issued, no withdrawal has been made, no retraction has been printed, no ethics investigation has been launched, absolutely nothing has been done about this issue by the Sask Party except use it to quote the Minister of Agriculture out of context, to accuse him of misleading the house and to attack the NDP for their lack of credibility.

<p>Code of Ethics Violation: Article 4, Clause 6: the dissemination of false information³¹ Article 4, Clause 1: Integrity in conduct³²</p>

Call for Investigation: No call for investigation to date

Case 4: Saskatchewan Teacher's Federation Donations

Who: Sask. Party MLA Allen Kerpan

When: April 3, 2006
(51 days after code of ethics passed)

What: Mr. Kerpan told a story about how he and his wife, who is a teacher, were very upset that she was forced through the Saskatchewan Teacher's Federation to donate to the NDP. Of course, the STF does not donate to the NDP. Even another member of the opposition admitted this was a false statement.

Mr. Kerpan's wife is a teacher, which is admirable. What is less admirable is his use of her status as a teacher to spread false information about teacher's everywhere. On April 3, 2006 in the house, Mr. Kerpan said, "Mr. Speaker, there's *no question* that some portions thereof, of teachers' actual STF membership fees, go to support certain political parties — speaking mainly of the socialist, NDP government. ... my wife spends part of her STF membership dues to campaign against me, Mr. Speaker"³³

The problem is, although it is a great political line, it is just not true. According to the Saskatchewan Teacher's Federation, they will "not enter into organizational affiliation with any political party"³⁴, the organization will "not align itself with any political party or group,"³⁵ and "the STF will not affiliate with any labour organization"³⁶

Code of Ethics Violation: Article 4, Clause 6: the dissemination of false information³⁷

Call for Investigation: "Over one week has passed and there has been no Sask Party correction. Mr. Speaker, Sask Party innuendo and dissemination of false and disingenuous information makes their credibility and code of ethics suspect. How does their statement and the lack of correction comply with Article 4, Clause 6 of the Sask Party code of ethics? I would encourage the member for Carrot River Valley do the honourable thing and take the opportunity to stand in this house and make a correction. Thank you."³⁸

Mr. Kerpan's Response: No Correction by Mr. Kerpan was made. However, one of the *other* Sask Party MLAs Mr. Gantefoer, took it upon himself to deal with this on behalf of Mr. Kerpan in the House. Mr. Gantefoer said, "I would like to first of all, on the public record, correct a comment that was made by my colleague, the member from Carrot River Valley, when he entered into the debate. He mistakenly implied that there was some direct connection between the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation and funding of the NDP party."³⁹ Note that this was not an apology, merely a correction of the facts, and it took place three weeks after the original offence was committed, and it was done by a member other than the one who committed the offence. And since they admit that Mr. Kerpan did in fact, knowingly disseminate false information, there should have to be an investigation under the Sask Party code of ethics.

Brad Wall's Response: *No investigation has been launched*

Again, we must ask

If this is not a breach of the code of ethics, then what is?

Case 5: Negativity about Oil Sands

Who: Sask. Party Leader Brad Wall

When: April 12, 2006
(60 days after code of ethics passed)

What: Mr. Wall said that if you search for “oil sands” on Google that the second site you get to is negative towards Saskatchewan. Not only is the article he quotes from not found by the search he mentions but the actual article is positive for business investment in Saskatchewan. Mr. Wall misrepresents what the real article says and misleads the House about how you find it. (Perhaps to avoid having anyone actually read it)

The Leader of the Opposition stood in the House on April 12 and said “In fact if you do a Google search on oil sands, on oil sands, *the second story that pops up* is from this resource review that says the problem in Saskatchewan is the political leadership, Mr. Speaker.”⁴⁰ And all the Sask Party MLA’s called out “Hear Hear”

The only problem is that this is completely untrue. If you google “oil sands” and even if you give Mr. Wall the benefit of the doubt and google “Saskatchewan oil sands” or even “Saskatchewan resource review” or then the first, second, third, fourth, or fifth site are not anywhere near related to what Mr. Wall is talking about⁴¹ In fact you examine the sites *actually* found by googling these search terms (on the day he said this in the House) you get quotes such as the following

*"[the oilsand exploration in Saskatchewan] is good news for the residents of La Loche, northern Saskatchewan's second-largest community, and members of the Clearwater River Dene First Nation."*⁴²

*With 25 years in the energy business, including stints with Suncor, [Chris] Hopkins [founder and vice-president of Synenco Energy Inc.] knows oilsands potential when he sees it. And he definitely sees it in Saskatchewan.*⁴³

*Saskatchewan creativity and "can-do" attitude have led to great advances in developing, adapting, and deploying new oil recovery technologies, from horizontal and infill wells to light and heavy EOR.*⁴⁴

You can, however, find on one of the sites a “stale data” category, presumably for news that is no longer useful or relevant and the first item of news under “stale data” – the Sask Party’s 100 ideas to grow Saskatchewan. Apparently the web Site “Major Oil Companies.com” doesn’t think that highly of those 100 ideas (and rightfully so!)

Mr. Wall quotes from the article “Yesterday they posted an article talking about the Saskatchewan oil sands. And here’s what they said, quote: Looking at a map, one possibility burned bright, Saskatchewan . . . In fact, looking deeper we found historical evidence that Saskatchewan hosts rich oil sands . . . even richer than Alberta’s. The problem is politics.”⁴⁵

In fact, the document that Mr. Wall is referring to is called “The Secret Oil Sands” written by a gentleman by the name of Doug Casey. Mr. Casey is a world-renowned investor and author who *in this very article* is advocating for people to invest in an oil company that is doing business in Saskatchewan⁴⁶. To quote from the rest of article “it turns out there is one little-known oil sands developer working in Saskatchewan. A company it just so happens holds a land package larger than all Alberta's oil sands projects combined. With management that has already built one oil sands company into a billion-dollar player.”⁴⁷ Mr. Wall should be ashamed of himself for taking this quote out of context and using it to attack Saskatchewan when the author is trying to promote it.

Mr. Wall won’t talk about the positive comments that you find when you *actually* search for “oil sands” on Google and he won’t talk about investment advisors talking about Saskatchewan companies in a positive light because it doesn’t promote his message of negativity that everything is wrong with Saskatchewan. It’s fine to think that Saskatchewan is a horrible place to live Mr. Wall, but you shouldn’t lie to convince other people that it is. (Actually, it is probably not even fine to think it, but there’s no accounting for political taste)

Code of Ethics Violation: Article 4, Clause 6: the dissemination of false information ⁴⁸
--

Call for Investigation: This was published in the NDP newsletter *The Commonwealth* which is delivered to the Sask Party caucus office.⁴⁹

Brad Wall’s Response: No apology has been issued, *No investigation has been launched*

Case 6: The “Greedy Corporate Huckster” Letter

Who: Sask. Party MLAs
Greg Brkich, Doreen Eagles,
Ted Merriman and
Ken Cheveldayoff

What: The Sask Party MLAs continually claim that the Premier or a Cabinet Minister wrote a particular, offensive, letter, all the time knowing that it was not any member of the government.

When: March 24 - April 12, 2006
(40 - 60 days after code of ethics passed)

This is a systematic campaign by the opposition MLA's to have the people of this province believe that the Government of Saskatchewan, or the Premier, have engaged in sending a letter that is insulting and engages in name-calling to the business of this province. A number of their MLA's have stood in the house and accused the Government, or a Minister, or the Premier of sending this letter

Mr. Brkich stood in the house and said, “You got a socialist government that basically does not work with oil companies. *You had the Premier who sent out letters — what did he call the corporations? — greedy corporate hucksters* [sic], you know.”⁵⁰

Ms. Eagles said, “And I find it ironic, Mr. Speaker, that this socialist government did the right thing regarding corporate taxes, because remember these are the people that the *NDP government refers to as greedy, corporate hucksters*. And remember the Regina Manifesto which this government still abides by that states no CCF-NDP government will rest content until capitalism has been eradicated from this province.”⁵¹

Mr. Merriman said “The current NDP reported that the Saskatoon business community — and this is the one that truly bothers him — were what? Greedy corporate hucksters, greedy corporate hucksters.”⁵²

Mr. Cheveldayoff said, “There's a famous letter that's been referenced in this debate. It's from October 23, 2003, and *I'll quote from the letter* It's a famous letter, Madam Speaker. It's the greedy corporate huckster letter. Madam Speaker, my question to the Minister of Industry and Resources is, who wrote this letter? Did he write it? Did the Finance Minister write it, or did the former Finance Minister author this letter?”⁵³

Here's the problem, if they were *quoting* from the letter, obviously they *have* the letter. If they have the letter, then they know who wrote it. The letter was not written by the Government, by the Premier, by the Minister of Industry and Resources, by the current Minister of Finance, by the former Minister of Finance or anyone else that the Sask Party MLA's said wrote the letter. Every time they accuse the government or one of the government members of writing it they were engaging in a conspiracy to disseminate false information.

But wait, maybe they were confused, maybe they thought that this letter was actually sent out by the government. Maybe all they are guilty of is just getting their facts wrong. That would still be pretty bad, making all these mistakes over a period of weeks in the house. But it would just be an example of ignorance rather than malice.

However, the fact is that they have known who wrote this letter for the *entire time they made these statements in the house*. This wasn't a simple mistake, it was a concentrated effort to disseminate false information to drag the Premier's name through the mud

The so-called "Greedy Corporate Hucksters" letter was actually put out by the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour (SFL) on November 29th 2004. In that letter, signed by Larry Hubich, the SFL does use the phrase. "Greedy Corporate Hucksters" This letter is not put out by the government, or the premier, or even the NDP, but by the SFL.

The Saskatchewan party themselves pointed out, in a press release last year, that this was the SFL and not the Premier. The title of the press release was "Please Mr. Premier, Tell us where you stand! – the SFL calls Business community "Greedy Corporate Hucksters"⁵⁴ and the opening sentence of that press release said, "Saskatchewan Party Leader Brad Wall today called on Premier Lorne Calvert to distance himself from Larry Hubich's characterization of the business community in this province as 'Greedy Corporate Hucksters'"⁵⁵

So early last year they knew that the government and the Premier did not write this letter and yet they insist on standing in the house and accusing the government and the Premier of doing so. This is a conspiracy to disseminate knowingly false information and this shows a complete lack of integrity on behalf of the Saskatchewan Party

<p>Code of Ethics Violation: Article 4, Clause 6: the dissemination of false information⁵⁶ Article 4, Clause 1: Integrity in conduct⁵⁷</p>

Call for Investigation: There has been no call for investigation to date

Case 7: Highway and Maintenance Shop Closures

Who: Sask Party MLAs
 Randy Weekes, Greg Brkich,
 Bob Bjornerud, Dennis Allchurch,
 Glen Hart

When: March 17 – May 10 2006
 (33 - 89 days after code of ethics passed)

What: A number of Sask Party MLA's keep claiming that highways and highway maintenance shops are closed or are closing. Four times they claimed that shops were closing down when they were not and three times they claimed that highways were closed when they were not, there were five members of the Saskatchewan party caucus involved over a period of 2 months, they worked really hard to be unethical here.

Mr. Weekes started the ball rolling on March 17th when he said, "A recent report from the Department of Highways outlines this government's plans for the equipment storage facilities and road clearing over the next decade. This report states some buildings must be closed because years of NDP [New Democratic Party] under-funding and neglect have left them in poor repair"⁵⁸

Of course the report says no such thing. In fact, under the *Conclusions* section it discusses the need for the facilities to be taken care of and utilized to their "full potential" Which, given that he was talking about the report, Mr. Weekes must have known. Not only that, but as part of the package that included the report there was analysis by the department of highways that included the following statement, "The Department has no approved plan to close any maintenance sections at the present time and has no approved plan to eliminate a specific number of maintenance sections over the medium or long term."⁵⁹ This seems hard to square with the claim by Mr. Weekes that this report "outlines this government's plans for the equipment storage facilities and road clearing over the next decade"⁶⁰. In fact, that is just a false statement that Mr. Weekes knew was false when he made it (assuming he actually read the report, or else he was just being stupid for quoting from a report he didn't read)

Just in case the member didn't read the whole report before using it as a prop in question period, the Minister of Highways informed the house "that this government has no intentions of closing the rural maintenance shops."⁶¹ Later he said, "There are no closures going to take place. Any of these would have to be signed by myself. I have no intention of doing that."⁶² So the members of the opposition knew that there would be no closures. Not that that stopped them from claiming that these closures would or did happen.

A few days later, Mr. Brkich claimed the following, “In my constituency alone, in Davidson ... now they’ve shut down Highway 20. They also want to shut down a highway section shop in Watrous.”⁶³ This is false information on a couple of fronts. First of all, Highway 20 was not shut down on that day, it was temporarily closed for a few hours the day before because of flooding⁶⁴ (which really can’t be blamed on the government) and secondly the government did not want to close down the highway section shop. But that wouldn’t be the last time the opposition claimed the government was shutting down maintenance shops.

On April 10th Mr. Allchurch said, “Let’s look at the highway maintenance shop in Shellbrook. *It’s closing down today* [April 10], yet the member from P.A. [Prince Albert] stated in this House, it’s not closing down today. He said that over and over. It’s not closing down today.”⁶⁵

And then (never one to let a good opportunity to spread false information pass by) Mr. Bjornerud just had to get his two cents in, “The Minister of Highways made a commitment that under his leadership as Minister of Highways none of these things would be closed. Well, Mr. Speaker, that seems to be contrary to what a study that they’ve done and a projection that they’ve done that they are closing these depots.”⁶⁶

As it turns out the highway maintenance shop in Shellbrook is not closing down, either on the day that Mr. Allchurch said or any day since then, as he was informed by the Minister almost 3 weeks earlier in the house. Apparently if the Sask Party had to listen to what was said in the house and then respond with truthful statements they would have a lot less to say. (Mr. Bjornerud should take note)

But not to confuse the matter, lets get back to Mr. Brkich claiming that highways were closed when they weren’t. On March 31st (almost 2 weeks after the highways had been reopened after being shut down for a few hours) Mr. Brkich again said, “Can the Minister of Highways explain to this House why the Highway 15 from the junction of Highway 20 east to the town of Semans has been closed down?”⁶⁷ How many times can he make this false statement?

Well, he keeps going, on April 11th (three weeks after the highway was reopened) Mr. Brkich again says, “Even a section of Highway 15 is closed down *right now*”⁶⁸. There were no closures of highway 15 in April. And it looks as if Mr. Brkich’s colleagues felt that his dissemination of false information was not going well enough so Mr. Hart decided to pitch in, “And the member from Arm River-Watrous has a highway in his constituency that was redone under that plan and that section of highway is closed, Mr. Speaker.”⁶⁹ At best this seems to be a bit too much fuss over water running over a highway for a few hours, at worst, part of a deliberate pattern of attacking the government over highway and maintenance shop closures that were, for the most part, a figment of the collective imaginations of the opposition.

Mr. Brkich keeps the ball rolling on May 10th when he says, “And what’s the response from this government, Madam Deputy Speaker, is [sic] to close the section shops in Watrous, take men from there, take equipment from there, and cut funding to the Department of Highways. Madam Deputy Speaker, that is a shame out there in rural Saskatchewan [sic]”⁷⁰

That is a total of 4 times they claimed that shops were closing down when they were not and 3 times they claimed that highways were closed when they were not, there were 5 members of the Saskatchewan party caucus involved over a period of 2 months. This can be describable as nothing less than a conspiracy to disseminate false information

Code of Ethics Violation: Article 4, Clause 6: the dissemination of false information⁷¹

Call for Investigation: When this issue first came up the Minister of Highways responded by saying, “Mr. Speaker, that is a prime example of why the Saskatchewan Party has no credibility with the general public — because the inflamed rhetoric, their misrepresentation on occasion of the facts, I would say, Mr. Speaker, is well documented and well known.”⁷²

Brad Wall's Response: No apology. *No investigation has been launched*

Case 8: Trivializing the “Baby Paige” Case

Who: Sask Party MLA Donna Harpauer.

When: May 1st, 2006
(77 days after code of ethics passed)

What: Ms. Harpauer (who was critical of the government for engaging in “gutter politics”) says that she heard, on tape, the Minister of Finance saying something he did not. She was taking Mr. Thomson’s comments *completely* out of context and using them to attack the government

On May 1st Ms. Harpauer accused the government of trivializing the so-called “baby Paige” case that was an issue in the Legislature. The Minister of Health made a statement in question period about the issue, “As members opposite will know, the Chair of the Saskatoon Regional Health Authority has issued an apology to the family with regards to patient baby Paige. Mr. Speaker, everyone, everyone within the Saskatoon Regional Health Authority and everyone within this government is very much interested in the long-term care for baby Paige Hansen. Whether it’s inside this province or outside this province, the best possible care available to her will be provided.”⁷³

Ms Harpauer took this opportunity to attack the government saying, “Mr. Speaker, it’s interesting the minister talks about how much his members of his government care and how much they want to respect the family because when I raised this issue on Friday, the Minister of Finance yelled across the floor: who died yet? Well, Mr. Speaker, is that what it takes before action is taken, for someone to die?... And *I personally listened to the tape* on Friday, and I hope the Minister of Health will distance himself from his colleague’s remarks.”⁷⁴

As it turns out, if Ms. Harpauer had listened to the tape then she would have heard exactly what the rest of the House and the media heard, which was something entirely different. So the media decided to question Ms. Harpauer about this discrepancy:

Question: I want to talk to you about what you point was about the finance minister’s comment

Harpauer: The frustration with the finance minister is that he constantly heckles across the floor with comments - sort of belittling situations that we bring to the Assembly. His comments, in my mind, suggested that because this baby didn’t die, it doesn’t have the same importance. And I think that’s unacceptable

Question: Did you hear what Dan D’Autremont said to Mr. Thomson that day? Because I did. What he said was in reference to the Health Minister’s comments that MRI’s go in for down time just like cars go to a service station to be serviced. And Dan Deutremont yelled ‘when you go to take your car in

to get it serviced, people don't die' and Andrew Thomson said, 'Who died, Dan?' and Dan said 'Well, no one yet' that was how the heckle came about.

Harpauer: "Who died yet' was the comment that was made which still, in my mind, means....

Question: To Dan D'Autremont, not to you

Harpauer: "So, OK, still, 'Who died Dan' so it's not important unless she did?"

Question: "Well, Dan said that people die from MRI's being taken in, so the question to him was, 'who died?'"

Harpauer: "I still don't get your point" Because Dan's right, if you take a car in to be repaired or an MRI to be repaired, no one dies, but Andrew Thomson's comment 'Well, who died Dan?' still belittles the fact that unless someone dies, then why is it important?

Question: "Well that's not what he said, he was responding to someone on your side saying that people are dieing when MRI's go down, but in this case there is no evidence that anyone died. So he asked, 'Who died?' you are the one who read a member's statement this year, and this is what I am curious about, about 'gutter politics' and not wanting gutter politics"⁷⁵

Interesting point, what did Ms. Harpauer say about gutter politics? To quote from her statement on March 23rd, "Mr. Speaker, it's a sign of just how desperate the NDP have become. Usually they wait until election time to pull out the gutter politics... They could come up with a plan to try to make the Premier look better — but of course that's impossible — so their only choice is try to smear the Leader of the Opposition.... Mr. Speaker, I was trying to think of the right word to describe this act of political desperation. There's sad, pathetic, sleazy, scummy. But you know what the right word is? Typical.... Mr. Speaker, it's interesting that the Premier doesn't share the same commitment to telling the truth and will stoop to the lowest form of gutter politics, a gutless, drive-by smear against the Leader of the Opposition."⁷⁶

Putting aside the hypocrisy of accusing the government of gutter politics while calling them sad, pathetic, sleazy, scummy, politically desperate and gutless, Ms. Harpauer seems to be calling for a higher standard in government.

Yet she is the one taking Mr. Thomson's comments *completely* out of context, which she must have known since she claimed she listened to the tape herself. Unless everyone else, including the media, heard the real comments except Ms. Harpauer. Either way, she was not being completely honest, and one this was pointed out to her she should have apologized.

Code of Ethics Violation: Article 4, Clause 1: Integrity in conduct ⁷⁷
--

Call for Investigation:

Sandra Morin pointed out the hypocrisy of this in the House, “Mr. Speaker, on February 12 of this year the Saskatchewan Party adopted a code of ethics. Mr. Speaker, apparently this document is not worth the paper it is written on. The members across the way have already contravened their code of ethics more times than I can count. The latest violation comes from the member from Humboldt. Yesterday she stood in this House and attacked the Minister of Finance, not just by misquoting him but by misquoting him out of context. The member opposite alleged that the minister had somehow demonstrated a lack of concern about a specific health case. Of course, Mr. Speaker, we all know that the minister was responding to the member from Cannington who was also in violation of their code of ethics. The opposition member claimed that people were dying when they were not. Now if the member from Humboldt had listened to the tape as she claimed she had, she would have quickly realized that her allegation was unfounded. Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time that we have pointed out that the Saskatchewan Party routinely dishonours their own code of ethics. Isn't it about time that the Leader of the Opposition either starts enforcing the code or admits that it is nothing but a cheap publicity stunt designed to distract attention from the routinely unethical actions of his caucus? Thank you, Mr. Speaker.”⁷⁸

Ms. Harpauer's Response: None

Brad Wall's Response: No apology *No investigation has been launched*

Case 9: The Labour Relations Board

Who: Sask Party MLA Ken Krawetz

When: May 3-4, 2006
(79 - 80 Days after code of ethics passed)

What: The Sask Party opposed the creation of a certain position on the Labour Relations Board, they criticized the person who filled that position and the rest of the board for being biased and too pro-union, they called for that persons resignation and they disagreed with anyone staying in their position once their term had expired. Now they are saying that that person was dismissed for being anti-union, he should keep his position, and he should have stayed on past his term.

This all started on May 3rd when Mr. Krawetz made the following allegations in the House,

“Mr. Speaker, was the Vice-Chair of Saskatchewan’s Labour Relations Board removed by this government because of his rulings? And does this not constitute an example of direct interference in the affairs of the board?”⁷⁹

Mr. Speaker, can the minister explain why this Vice-Chair was removed apparently in violation of The Trade Union Amendment Act?⁸⁰

“In this matter, it appears someone has lost a job with the Labour Relations Board ... This also appears to be in direct violation of The Trade Union Amendment Act,”⁸¹

“Mr. Speaker, it is alleged this interference took place in June 2005. Mr. Speaker, will the current Minister of Labour undertake to ask the former minister of Labour if the Vice-Chair of the Labour Relations Board was asked to resign”⁸²

It would seem from all that as if the government had directly interfered with Mr. Matkowski and had removed him from his office in violation of the Trade Union Act. That is certainly what Mr. Krawetz is implying here and would want people to believe.

The only problem is that Mr. Krawetz also points out a number of facts that contradict these earlier claims of “political interference”. Mr. Krawetz says, “Mr. Speaker, I have obtained a copy of an affidavit of Mr. Matkowski prepared by his legal counsel. On pages 2 and 3 of that affidavit, Mr. Matkowski states that on June 24, 2005, he was told by the deputy minister of Labour that he would not be reappointed”⁸³

So **according to Mr. Krawetz**, Mr. Matkowski says, in a sworn affidavit, that he was told he would not be re-appointed, and then, 8 months later, he is not re-appointed. How is this “political interference” and how is this in “violation of The Trade Union Amendment Act”?

Mr. Krawetz tries to quote from the Act in an attempt to make his smear stick. He says in the House, “I want to quote from The Trade Union Act, section no. 4, clause (1.2). And this is what it says: If the term of a member of the board expires after the member has begun hearing a matter before the board but before the proceeding is completed, the member may continue as if his or her term had not expired for the purpose of completing the proceeding.”⁸⁴

The only way in which this could not be a deliberate attempt by Mr. Krawetz to knowingly mislead the House is if he does not know what the word “may” means. If Mr. Krawetz wants to hide behind a shield of sheer stupidity that is fine, but he should still apologize to the House.

It’s also somewhat surprising that Mr. Krawetz would rise to defend the Labour Relations Board saying, “Working men and women in our province must know their rights are being protected by an independent board.”⁸⁵ Given some of the things that the Sask Party have said about the Labour Relations Board in the past such as when their Labour critic at the time, Mr. Weekes said, “Again and again the decisions by the Labour Relations Board has been unfair and biased”⁸⁶

It is also a bit odd that Mr. Krawetz would stand in the house and say that Mr. Matkowski should be kept on past the time of his term expiring, because Mr. Krawetz had this to say at the time the act was changed to put this provision in, “Mr. Speaker, one of the clauses in this Bill is a clause that will extend the term of a board member who is leaving the board and allow that board member to continue in that role until a decision is rendered on the cases that they are involved with. Mr. Speaker, can you imagine?... And now we’re going to allow members of the board to remain, I guess, on the payroll until a decision is rendered. Mr. Speaker, I think that this will create tremendous concern.”⁸⁷

So back in 2005 Mr. Krawetz was against keeping people on past their term, but now he a strong defender of this idea? There may be no ought right lie here but there is certainly hypocritical and shameful conduct.

Mr. Krawetz also made a very large deal about the fact that Mr. Matkowski was asked to leave before his term had expired (Never mind that Mr. Matkowski did in fact serve his full term.) Apparently simply bringing up the idea that he would not be reappointed is grounds for so-called political interference. Mr. Krawetz asks, “Mr. Speaker, my question is this. Can this minister tell us if he received representations asking him to take Mr. Matkowski off the LRB [Labour Relations Board]?”⁸⁸

Well, actually, the answer to this question has to be yes. The Minister of Labour has heard people calling for the removal of Mr. Matkowski – the problem is that they were members of the Saskatchewan Party. Mr. Stewart said about the amendment to the Trade Union Act in 2005 that, “No amendment ... should be considered unless the government is willing to remove all current members of the Labour Relations Board and reappoint a full board”⁸⁹

So they think the Board (including Mr. Matkowski) has been unfair and biased, and they wanted all of the members (including Mr. Matkowski) removed from the board. That is a bit difficult to square with their defense of Mr. Matkowski.

Particularly since they disagreed with even creating the position that Mr. Matkowski filled. When the government proposed creating a second vice-chair for the board this is what the labour critic for the Saskatchewan Party (who should be speaking for the entire party as their official critic) said, “Another aspect of this Bill is the Labour Relations Board will need a second Vice-Chair. Well we ask why? Well it’s only . . . the Chair will only be there to force unionization down workers’ throats.”⁹⁰

A review of the timeline is as follows: Mr. Matkowski was hired for a five-year term in 2001. He served that **full** five-year term until 2006, notwithstanding calls by the opposition in 2005 to remove him. Then, in 2006, when his **entire** five-year term was finished, he was done. Political interference: none. Number of dismissals: none.

Again, most of the opposition’s statements are not technically untrue (except the opening lines by Mr. Krawetz) but they are certainly hypocritical and disingenuous at best, and cannot be any stretch of the imagination be considered to demonstrate “integrity in conduct”

<p>Code of Ethics Violation: Article 4, Clause 6: the dissemination of false information⁹¹ Article 4, Clause 1: Integrity in conduct⁹²</p>

Call for Investigation: The Minister of Labour pointed out the unethical nature of these activities at the time, saying “Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about the allegations that were made in this House and not made outside the House. This is very troubling about the kind of way the members opposite, the Sask Party, operates. They work within the protection of this House, but yet refuse to make the same allegations outside.”⁹³

Brad Wall’s Response: *No investigation has been launched*

Case 10: False Advertising

Who: The Sask Party Caucus Featuring Brad Wall

When: May 8th, 2006 (84 days after code of ethics passed)

What: Mr. Wall appeared in an add that said tuition cost were rising (as the picture below demonstrates) When caught in this factual anomaly, Mr. Wall then uses other factual anomalies to explain to reporters what had happened.

The Saskatchewan Party started airing a commercial on or around May 8th. The commercial is basically Brad Wall standing on front of a blank screen and talking to the camera while different quotes come up on the screen. Such quotes as “Rising Tuition Costs” and he talks about the poor performance of the government.⁹⁴



The major problem with this is that tuition is in fact not rising. Which the Saskatchewan Party caucus was aware, as demonstrated with the following statements by members of that caucus.

Ms. Draude said, “We have an education tuition freeze which most students definitely were in favour of.”⁹⁵ And the finance critic, Mr. Cheveldayoff, said, “half of the new money directed at our province’s universities will be taken up with a two-year tuition freeze for students, Mr. Speaker. And, Mr. Speaker, any time that more money is put into post-secondary education, members on this side of the House are supportive”⁹⁶

So it seems a bit hypocritical for trying to tell students they support the tuition freeze while advertising on TV that the freeze does not exist.

There is another problem with this commercial in that it is not even internally consistent. The very first thing that Mr. Wall says in the commercial is that “Thanks to high oil prices, the Calvert NDP government has more money than ever.”⁹⁷ But then goes on to list as one of the problems: “Is it cheaper to put gas in your vehicle?” While the phrase ‘gas prices skyrocketing’ flashes in the background.

You can’t have it both ways Mr. Wall, either the high gas prices are good for the province or they are bad for the province, you can’t claim both in the same 30 second television commercial!

Also, the Saskatchewan Party is running another commercial that talks about how Saskatchewan is losing jobs. Of course, it was pointed out to them that Saskatchewan actually has more jobs this year than last year in the House by Mr. Forbes, “Mr. Speaker, it’s interesting on a day like today, when we’ve had good news about the employment numbers for April — 3,700 new jobs — and we are moving in the right direction, the member opposite just wants to mud sling.”⁹⁸

The media thought it was a bit odd that the Sask Party would continue to run these ads if they were not true. So they questioned the critic of industry and resources, Mr. Stewart:

Question: Is the Saskatchewan party going to change the commercial now, they’re running a commercial now saying that Saskatchewan continues to lose jobs.

Stewart: Well, I suppose if there’s another month maybe we’ll have to look at that. Certainly, we’re still losing, really losing jobs to other provinces. I mean, well, our numbers were up slightly over this April to April period, we still continue to lose our young people, so the spirit of the ad is still correct; well maybe technically mathematically we might have to review it.⁹⁹

So “technically, mathematically” it is wrong to claim that we are losing jobs. (which is nice of him to admit given that it is a simple matter of comparing two numbers and determine which is the bigger one) but the “spirit” of the ad is still correct? It must be the spirit of unethical practice that characterizes all the Sask Party advertising.

Code of Ethics Violation: Article 4, Clause 6: the dissemination of false information ¹⁰⁰

Call for Investigation: The Premier stood in the House and said, “ Because what do we get from that Leader of the Opposition? Taxpayer ads, taxpayer-paid-for ads that are totally wrong, totally wrong in their fact.”¹⁰¹

Brad Wall's Response: Mr. Wall was asked, be the media about the “higher tuition costs” claim:

Question: Was there a mistake in your original ad?

Brad Wall: That was not a mistake, that was an ad that had ran previously, and it was not a mistake when it ran. However, after the budget we wanted to make sure that it reflected what had happened in the budget, there was a tuition freeze but we still have high tuition fees to other provinces.

Question: But that's not true because there was a freeze in last year's budget too¹⁰²

Mr. Wall is claiming that the commercial was accurate when it ran. However, the commercial was airing on May 8th. This was over 4 weeks since the budget had been released with a two-year tuition freeze and over 1 year since the budget last year with a tuition freeze. There is no way this statement could be true.

When Mr. Wall is caught in a lie, he just lies some more to get out of it.

No apology *No investigation has been launched, lies were told*

Case 11 (16): General Disinformation

Who: Sask Party MLAs Randy Weekes, Allen Kerpan, Brad Wall, Dennis Allchurch, Dan D'Autremont, Lyle Stewart

When: March 23 - May 9, 2006 (39 – 83 days after code of ethics passed)

What: Taken individually, any of these could be taken for a honest mistake, a slip of the tongue, or rhetorical excess, but taken as a whole they can only be viewed as a group of individuals who don't check their facts before speaking, or routinely mislead the public, or just simply have no credibility.

Mr Weekes: "And another very important group in Saskatchewan which the minister and his officials did not speak to is FACS, the Farm Animal Council of Saskatchewan. And the Farm Animal Council is made up of practically I believe every livestock association in the province, and the minister did not go and speak to that group."¹⁰³

Fact: The Minister did in fact meet with FACS. You would think that Mr. Weekes would have known that when he stood up in the house given that in that very same speech he mentioned that his farm belonged to the Farm Animal Council.¹⁰⁴

Brad Wall: Was asked in a media interview "What exactly did you do in the government [of Grant Devine]?"¹⁰⁵ To which Mr. Wall answered, "I was a ministerial assistant for the government...for two ministers, for Graham Taylor and John Gerrich"¹⁰⁶

Fact: Mr. Wall actually worked for three different ministers. He left out that he was a ministerial assistant for the then Minister of Education Pat Smith in 1984. He either forgot where he was employed or he is trying to cover up his work for the Devine Government

Mr. Kerpan: "And I find it incredibly, incredibly amazing that he [Peter Prebble] could stand up with that holier-than-thou, pompous, arrogant, socialist attitude and talk about something that I can't be responsible for....He ought to be ashamed of himself. And I know that, *I know* that the reason he's doing it is because he sees the polling results in his riding, in his constituency, and he knows that he's in a desperate situation. And he's trying to play desperate politics to get re-elected. Mr. Speaker, I can hardly wait for the next election."¹⁰⁷

Fact: Mr. Pebble is not running for re-election which is why he was no longer a cabinet minister at the time of this debate.

Mr. D'Autremont: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, last week the Saskatchewan Party brought this legislature news of the Premier's southeast dinner in Weyburn. The Premier was to talk about his vision of the future for this province. However there was a glitch. No one wanted to hear this no-vision speech. That's right, Mr. Speaker. The Premier's southeast dinner has been cancelled — no sales. The Regina organizers of the big event informed people by email that the Premier and his caucus were no longer coming to Weyburn."¹⁰⁸

Fact: The e-mail the member is referring to said *postponed* not cancelled. It was felt that the event should take place after the by-election rather than before it so that the Sask Party could not accuse the NDP of using public money to campaign. So instead they had to spread false rumors that the event was cancelled.

Lyle Stewart: Last week, the NDP government announced a \$1.5 million grant for World Wide Pork in Moose Jaw, which has been closed for nearly a year. Some media outlets reported that the Official Opposition Saskatchewan Party supports this 11th hour bailout. However, in responding to this announcement, Saskatchewan Party MLA Lyle Stewart outlined the opposition's position, stating that "We don't believe in equity investment or direct investment in business by the taxpayers of this province"¹⁰⁹

Fact: The reason why the Media claimed that Mr. Stewart and the Saskatchewan Party were in favour of the bailout was because in the House, Mr. Stewart said, "And I wonder if the minister's aware that the employees have approximately \$700,000 or 750,000 maybe in place for investment in this plant and that what they need from his government is some sort of a backing for another 500,000"¹¹⁰ and then when the announcement was made, Mr. Stewart said, "'Well, naturally, I am delighted that the plant, you know, being close to my own home, has another shot at survival."¹¹¹

Mr. D'Autremont: "Maybe someone could ask the same question of the Premier, the member for Saskatoon Riversdale, who actually lives a couple of hundred kilometres away in Moose Jaw."¹¹²

Fact: The Premier of course lives in Saskatoon, and has since 2001.

<p>Code of Ethics Violation: Article 4, Clause 6: the dissemination of false information¹¹³</p>

Appendix A

Googling for bad government press

For each of the following searches the top five sites as of April 12 are listed and analyzed for good and bad news about the government of Saskatchewan's policies

“oil sands”

Site 1 - <http://www.oilsandsdiscovery.com/>

No mention of politics or government policy

Site 2 – The Canadian Oil Sands Trust <http://www.cos-trust.com/>

No mention of politics or government policy

Site 3 - <http://www.westernoilsands.com/>

No mention of politics or government policy

Site 4 – The Government of Alberta Web Site <http://www.energy.gov.ab.ca/89.asp>

No mention of SASKATCHEWAN politics or government

Site 5 – Government of Canada Athabasca Oil Sands Page

<http://collections.ic.gc.ca/oil/index1.htm>

No mention of SASKATCHEWAN politics or government

“Saskatchewan Oil Sands”

Site 1 – Government of Saskatchewan Web Site <http://www.gov.sk.ca>

Self-explanatory

Site 2 – Government of Saskatchewan Industry and Resources <http://www.ir.gov.sk.ca/>

Self-explanatory

Site 3 – Canwest Petroleum <http://www.canwestpetroleum.com/s/Home.asp>

This site has positive stories about Saskatchewan

Site 4 – Gas and Oil dot com <http://www.gasandoil.com/goc/news/ntn53965.htm>

This site has positive stories about Saskatchewan

Site 5 – Major Oil Companies

<http://www.motoroilcompanies.com/oilsands/oilsandssaskatchewan/>

This site has a number of news stories about oil and gas

“Saskatchewan Resource Review”

Site 1 – Government of Saskatchewan Web Site <http://www.gov.sk.ca/>
Self-explanatory

Site 2 – Online Travel Canada – Yukon Review <http://muroise.myzen.co.uk>
No mention of politics or government policy

Site 3 – University of Saskatchewan Research
http://www.usask.ca/research/ethics_review/resources.php
This site has positive stories about Saskatchewan

Site 4 – Government of Canada website <http://www.agr.gc.ca/pfra/pub/palintro.pdf>
Self-explanatory

Site 5 – Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce

References:

- ¹ Saskatchewan Party Code of Ethics, Article 1, Paragraph 3
- ² Saskatchewan Party Code of Ethics, Article 5, Clause 1
- ³ Transcription of media interview - March 30, 2006
- ⁴ Transcription of media interview - March 30, 2006
- ⁵ Saskatchewan Party Code of Ethics, Article 4, Clause 6
- ⁶ Hansard, March 31, 2006, Page 917
- ⁷ Saskatoon Star Phoenix, Sat 01 April 2006 Page A8
- ⁸ Hansard, November 29, 2004 Page 13
- ⁹ Saskatoon Star Phoenix, Dec 09 2005 Page A15
- ¹⁰ Hansard, April 10, 2006, Page 1056
- ¹¹ Hansard, April 10, 2006, Page 1056-1057
- ¹² Hansard April 11, 2006, Page 1112
- ¹³ Transcription of media interview - April 10, 2006
- ¹⁴ Transcription of media interview - April 10, 2006
- ¹⁵ Transcription of media interview - April 10, 2006
- ¹⁶ Regina Leader Post, Thus 13 April
- ¹⁷ Transcription of media interview - April 11, 2006
- ¹⁸ Hansard, April 10, 2006, Page 1057
- ¹⁹ Saskatchewan Party Code of Ethics, Article 4, Clause 6
- ²⁰ Hansard, April 13, 2006, Page 1057
- ²¹ Hansard, April 21, 2006, Page 1255
- ²² Hansard, March 28, 2006, Page 837
- ²³ Hansard, March 28, 2006, Page 837
- ²⁴ Transcription of media interview – March 31st 2006
- ²⁵ Humbolt Journal, Thursday Apr 06, 2006, Page 11
- ²⁶ Transcription of media interview – April 10th 2006
- ²⁷ Transcription of media interview – April 10th 2006
- ²⁸ Transcription of media interview – April 10th 2006
- ²⁹ Hansard, April 12 2006 Page 1164-1165
- ³⁰ Hansard, April 6, 2006, Page 1000
- ³¹ Saskatchewan Party Code of Ethics, Article 4, Clause 6
- ³² Saskatchewan Party Code of Ethics, Article 4, Clause 6
- ³³ Hansard April 3, 2006, Page 956
- ³⁴ Page 41 Saskatchewan Teacher's Federation 2005-2006 Statement of Policy and Bylaws (updated January 1, 2006) Article 2, section 2.8.2

³⁵ Page 41 Saskatchewan Teacher's Federation 2005-2006 Statement of Policy and Bylaws (updated January 1, 2006) Article 2, section 2.9.4

³⁶ Page 41 Saskatchewan Teacher's Federation 2005-2006 Statement of Policy and Bylaws (updated January 1, 2006) Article 2, section 2.9.5

³⁷ Saskatchewan Party Code of Ethics, Article 4, Clause 6

³⁸ Hansard, April 12 2006, Page 1145

³⁹ Hansard, April 24, 2006, Page 1297

⁴⁰ Hansard, March 12, 2006, Page 1150 [emphasis added]

⁴¹ See Appendix A

⁴² Leader Post, Mon Mar 20, 2006 "Oilsands project in Sask." Found @ <http://www.canwestpetroleum.com/MediaArticles>

⁴³ Leader Post, Mon Mar 20, 2006 "Oilsands project in Sask." Found @ <http://www.canwestpetroleum.com/MediaArticles>

⁴⁴ Dr. Laurier L. Schramm "Oil in Saskatchewan" found @ <http://www.gasandoil.com/goc/news/ntn53965.htm>

⁴⁵ Hansard, April 12, 2006, Page 1150

⁴⁶ Casey, Doug "The Secret Oil Sands" Casey Energy Speculator April 12, 2006

⁴⁷ Casey, Doug "The Secret Oil Sands" Casey Energy Speculator April 12, 2006

⁴⁸ Saskatchewan Party Code of Ethics, Article 4, Clause 6

⁴⁹ "Brad Wall violates own code of Ethics" *Commonwealth* May 2006 Vol 66.2

⁵⁰ Hansard, April 7, 2006, Page 1047

⁵¹ Hansard, April 12, 2006, Page 1160

⁵² Hansard, April 12, 2006, Page 1164

⁵³ Hansard, March 24, 2006, Page 789

⁵⁴ Saskatchewan Party Press Release Friday, January 14, 2005

⁵⁵ Saskatchewan Party Press Release Friday, January 14, 2005

⁵⁶ Saskatchewan Party Code of Ethics, Article 4, Clause 6

⁵⁷ Saskatchewan Party Code of Ethics, Article 4, Clause 6

⁵⁸ Hansard, March 17, 2006, Page 650

⁵⁹ Information provided from Department, April 17th 2006

⁶⁰ Hansard, March 17, 2006 Page 650

⁶¹ Hansard, March 17, 2006 Page 650

⁶² Hansard, March 17, 2006 Page 650

⁶³ Hansard, March 22, 2006, Page 726

⁶⁴ Information provided by Department of Highways

⁶⁵ Hansard, April 10, 2006 Page 1083

⁶⁶ Hansard, April 12, 2006, Page 1171

- ⁶⁷ Hansard, March 31, 2006 Page 915
- ⁶⁸ Hansard, April 11, 2006 Page 1110
- ⁶⁹ Hansard, April 11, 2006, Page 1138
- ⁷⁰ Hansard, May 10, 2006, Page 1604
- ⁷¹ Saskatchewan Party Code of Ethics, Article 4, Clause 6
- ⁷² Hansard, March 17, 2006, Page 651
- ⁷³ Hansard, May 1, 2006, Page 1438
- ⁷⁴ Hansard, May 1, 2006, Page 1439
- ⁷⁵ Transcription of media interview - April 7, 2006
- ⁷⁶ Hansard, March 23, 2006, Page 741
- ⁷⁷ Saskatchewan Party Code of Ethics, Article 4, Clause 6
- ⁷⁸ Hansard, May 2, 2006, Page 1450
- ⁷⁹ Hansard, May 3, 2006, Page 1500
- ⁸⁰ Hansard, May 3, 2006, Page 1500
- ⁸¹ Hansard, May 3, 2006, Page 1501
- ⁸² Hansard, May 4, 2006, Page 1516
- ⁸³ Hansard, May 3, 2006, Page 1500
- ⁸⁴ Hansard, May 3, 2006, Page 1500
- ⁸⁵ Hansard, May 4, 2006, Page 1515
- ⁸⁶ Hansard, November 23, 2004 , Page 1876
- ⁸⁷ Hansard, May 12 2005, Page 3044
- ⁸⁸ Hansard, May 4, 2006, Page 1529
- ⁸⁹ Hansard, April 5, 2005, Page 2380
- ⁹⁰ Hansard, June 27, 2000, Page 2220
- ⁹¹ Saskatchewan Party Code of Ethics, Article 4, Clause 6
- ⁹² Saskatchewan Party Code of Ethics, Article 4, Clause 6
- ⁹³ Hansard, May 4, 2006, Page 1515
- ⁹⁴ Saskatchewan Party Adverting, Tape obtained May 8th 2006.
- ⁹⁵ Hansard, April 10, 2006, Page 1062
- ⁹⁶ Hansard, April 7, 2006, Page 1031
- ⁹⁷ Saskatchewan Party Adverting, Tape obtained May 8th 2006.
- ⁹⁸ Hansard, May 5, 2006, Page 1451
- ⁹⁹ Transcription of media interview – May , 2006
- ¹⁰⁰ Saskatchewan Party Code of Ethics, Article 4, Clause 6
- ¹⁰¹ Hansard, May 17, 2006, Page 1710
- ¹⁰² Transcription of media interview – May 17th , 2006
- ¹⁰³ Hansard, March 23, 2006, Page 16

¹⁰⁴ Hansard, March 23, 2006, Page 24

¹⁰⁵ Transcription of media interview - April 7, 2006

¹⁰⁶ Transcription of media interview - April 7, 2006

¹⁰⁷ Hansard, April 11, 2006 Page 1148

¹⁰⁸ Hansard, April 25, 2006, Page 1331

¹⁰⁹ Saskatchewan Party Press Release Accessed from www.lylestewart.ca on March 9th 2006

¹¹⁰ Hansard of the Economy Committee April 26 2006 Page 450

¹¹¹ Regina Leader Post.: Apr 28, 2006. pg. B.4

¹¹² Hansard, May 16, 2006, Page 1696

¹¹³ Saskatchewan Party Code of Ethics, Article 4, Clause 6